DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 731 SP 025 984

AUTHOR Wall, James E.
TITLE Program of Research and Evaluation for Public Schools: Rationale and Implementation of an Agency for Change through Data-Based Cooperation and Service.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Denver, CO, February 27-March 2, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *College School Cooperation; *Consortia; Educational Change; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Program Evaluation; *Public Schools; *Research Utilization; Schools of Education

ABSTRACT

A description is given of interactions between institutions of higher education and the public schools that exist in a consortium known as PREPS (Program of Research and Evaluation for Public Schools). The major purpose of PREPS is to provide research and evaluation services to its member schools, with heavy emphasis upon evaluation research and the use and application of evaluation results. With the help of the PREPS staff, local school personnel identify and describe curricular programs, projects and problems that need researching or evaluating. This paper offers a profile of current activities in PREPS, how it began, the antecedents that led to its inception, and problems it has encountered. A discussion is presented on the relationship between the College of Education at Mississippi State University and the 31 public school districts it serves. The discussion highlights the benefits derived by all participants in the consortium. The criteria for judging a successful, mutually beneficial consortium are summarized. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED256731

PROGRAM OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS: RATIONALE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AN AGENCY FOR CHANGE THROUGH DATA-BASED COOPERATION AND SERVICE

by
James E. Wall, Associate Dean (R&D)
College of Education
Mississippi State University
P.O. Box 5365
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. E. Wall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP025984

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), Denver, Colorado, February 27-March 2, 1985.

The purpose of this paper is to describe improved interactions between institutions of higher education (IHE) and public schools such as those that exist in a consortium like PREPS (Program of Research and Evaluation for Public Schools). Primarily, PREPS is nontraditional, it does not fit the stereotypic image of traditional consortia or any other agencies that purport to interact with public schools in a service capacity.

In order to be precise about higher education-public school interaction in the PREPS instance, it seems appropriate to take a brief look at what PREPS currently is, how it began, the antecedents that led to its inception, problems it has encountered along the way, and how at least one College of Education and its university parent institution have benefited from association with the consortium while simultaneously delivering services in support of it. In scanning this paper, the reader is invited at the outset to be alert to possible changing roles, images, and the like, in both the IHE and the public school.

The PREPS Concept. PREPS is not the brainchild of any single individual; the best thinking of many knowledgeable people has gone into its formulation, its implementation, and its evolution to what it is today. Several long-term national and state trends led to the inception of PREPS. For most of America's history, it was believed that education led to employment, employment led to a better lifestyle, and a better lifestyle produced a better citizen. Another way of saying this is that employment has remained the solution of choice for all Americans. But during the 1960's and early 1970's, faith in the education, employment, and training programs that were designed to redress many of these problems waned considerably. The demand by school boards and citizens in the community for accountability in schools was probably the most influential factor that

gave rise to PREPS. Directly related to accountability was the continued growth in the late 1960's and early 1970's of the general national trend of disenchantment with the public school system as well as with many of our other social institutions. Educational research itself was not faring well at the time either. In like manner, the U.S. General Accounting Office reported to the U.S. Congress in 1973 that, "More than $200 million in educational research has produced little evidence of significant impact in classrooms." Simultaneously with these trends, there was an emerging recognition that education might have great potential as an economic development tool, especially as an attractant to new industry in some states. What seemed to be needed was improved institutional capacity to recognize the need for and become proactive in directing change in the schools.

These and other related trends of the early 1970's were common topics that were discussed in meetings of professional educators who had long recognized the dire need for data which could serve as the basis for improving the public education system. The ground swell continued until the latter part of 1975 when several school superintendents approached the College of Education (COE) at Mississippi State University (MSU) to see if a joint venture could be embarked upon that would provide sound data for making curricula changes. Numerous discussions were held with many school administrators operating in various capacities at different educational levels across the state. The resulting consensus was that building a base of sound decision-making data was, and still is, the first priority of all educational personnel who are involved with improving educational practice. MSU was asked to become a partner in this venture because of its strong commitment to service -- in addition to its commitments to research and teaching -- as a land grant institution.

Throughout the Spring and Summer of 1976, efforts were exerted to recruit school districts into PREPS and to familiarize them with its purpose and mission. By July, 1976, ten school districts had tentatively committed themselves to membership in the consortium and began trying to recruit some of the other 143 districts in the state. Convincing school superintendents of the potential payoff for joining PREPS was not easy at that time. Most were skeptical of the promised research results because their perception of the type of research to be conducted through PREPS would, in all probability, be the same as that which they themselves had conducted while completing doctoral dissertations. With verbal guarantees that such would not necessarily be the case, the first ten schools signed memoranda of agreement and PREPS became a functional consortium of public schools working cooperatively and collaboratively with the MSU/COE. Membership grew steadily from 10 in 1976 to 31 in 1984.

The 31 public school districts that are currently members of the consortium comprise about one-fifth of the 153 school districts in Mississippi. These 31 school districts contain about 40% of the total state enrollment of public school students.

The major purpose of PREPS is to provide research and evaluation services to its member schools at a cost they can afford, the idea being that costs can be reduced by doing things collectively instead of individually by each school. Since 1976, PREPS has operated as a consortium with each separate school district contracting individually with Mississippi State University. In 1984 the consortium became an independent incorporated entity, capable of contracting as PREPS, Inc. with whomever and for whatever purposes it desires. Its basic mission of school practice improvement will remain the same, but its activities will be greatly expanded.

The Nature of PREPS Activities. Research for school reform is not unique to Mississippi. Most progressive countries and states throughout the world recognize that research plays a pivotal role in school reform. As long ago as 1940, Sweden appointed a commission to study educational reform and the place of research in reform. Again in 1946, Sweden appointed a second commission to discover what research could do to provide an extended knowledge base for educational reform proposals. Similar movements and activities focusing on school reform have occurred periodically since that time in Sweden, Germany, and the United States.

Some states have even undertaken school reform activities within the confines of their borders, Mississippi being one. Most knowledgeable educators in Mississippi will agree that PREPS played a major role in the passage by the Mississippi Legislature of the Education Reform Act of 1982, the most important education act in more than 50 years for this state.

Criticisms of educational research, especially basic educational research, in the U.S. date back to 1950 when Isaac Kandel recorded his doubts of the extent to which the mass of material reviewed in the first Encyclopedia of Educational Research would lead to improvement in educational practice and reform. Others have used terms like "trivial," "irrelevant to classroom practice," and "inconsequential" to describe educational research that had been conducted "seemingly unaware of where the crucial problems lie." (J. Myrar Atkin, Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1967-68, No. 5, 338-45.)

Some of the same trends that finally gave impetus to PREPS had earlier also pointed to the need for revamping and redirecting educational research in the U.S. The creation of the National Institute of Education to supplement the regional education laboratories and the educational research and

development centers seems to have been the culmination of many of these forces. And, even though perpetually plagued with inappropriate funding for research, NIE still can point with justifiable pride to many successes since its inception.

But, even with all this flurry of activity in educational research at the national and regional levels, there seemed always to be inordinately slow growth and emphasis in educational research at state and local levels. Similar patterns of slow-growth, or no-growth, have characterized research at teacher education colleges and schools. For the most part, educational research over a long period of time was conducted chiefly by social scientists who were expected to provide an extended knowledge base for educational practice and policy. This was expected, it seems, primarily because of an "interventionist ideology characteristic of the welfare state."

Gradually, the question was formulated: "If learning is supposed to be the most important product of our schools, then why is educational research not more concerned with the instruction of students?" With this question in mind, it appears that the past few years have seen a remarkable increase in carrying on relevant and effective research in the instructional arena. Research on <u>results</u> is now possible because most teachers now specify what their students are supposed to learn. This has not always been the case. When teachers do not specify what the students should be learning, then the <u>process</u> of teaching becomes more important than the <u>results</u> of teaching (student learning). Similarly, educational research, until recently, was concentrated on the <u>process</u> of education rather than on the <u>results</u> of education, and on the <u>process</u> of research (procedures), rather than on the <u>results</u> of research. As a result, according to scientists in other disciplines, educational research became a non-science

because of its emphasis on man-made phenomena, such as teaching methods, teaching media, various teaching environments, and the like. Similarly, the emphasis on teaching rather than on learning made the traditional teacher's role an art form rather than a science. Teacher education colleges and schools suffered from the same orientation problems.

The upshot of all this is that if the teacher does not facilitate measurable learning, then the evaluation of educational programs is next to impossible, with the exception of gathering a few data on the process of teaching. And, because universities, colleges, and schools of education had traditionally emphasized process of teaching to the exclusion of results of teaching, most of them labored under the misconception that they could not meet the immediate demands of educational practitioners; hence, they did not have contributions to make to school reform, so they thought.

PREPS has changed this viewpoint, at least in Mississippi. Since the inception of PREPS in 1976, it has been demonstrated time and time again that a dedicated college of education -- given appropriate resources, commitment, and staff expertise -- can have a major impact on educational reform. The key seems to have been that, through the urging of some public school districts, the IHE's educational research orientation changed from that of process of teaching to results of teaching. This meant a major emphasis was placed on evaluation research by PREPS. And this is probably the major reason why the MSU/COE became eagerly involved with the PREPS consortium.

Growth of interest in and reliance on evaluation research by public schools over the past few years has increased phenomenally. Local school boards have expressed urgent need for accountability evaluations. Requests have grown for technical assistance in developing evaluation designs and

for training persons in evaluation skills within local school districts. Certain federal education acts require evaluations of programs that are funded through them. Most federal education programs require that a percentage of the budget of specially funded projects be set aside for evaluation. For a few years before the inception of PREPS in 1976, surveys of the needs of public schools in Mississippi revealed that educational program evaluation was the topic above all others about which further information was needed.

Interest in education program evaluation also has been manifested in the numbers of local school personnel who attend and participate in training and orientation programs, seminars, meetings, and workshops in evaluation. PREPS in 1976 had 10 school districts as members. During that early period, each district sent one or two persons to the first annual workshop on evaluation strategies/methods. Since then, attendance has increased geometrically with each school sending as many as 10 teachers to a given training session. PREPS now holds more than one workshop each year, frequently dividing the sessions for beginner and advanced groups. More than 1,000 teachers and administrators in Mississippi have attended evaluation, test development, or microcomputer workshops sponsored by PREPS. The major impact of all this has been that research and evaluation technologies in education have been lifted up and made more visible to others in the field of education, to the legislature, to those in other governmental agencies, and to the public at large.

In fields other than education, evaluation research has been met with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Newcomers to a field view evaluation as having great potential for assuring mission accomplishment, but many old-timers are reluctant to spend time learning new techniques for utilization

of evaluation findings that will further reform, renewal, and revision. This viewpoint of evaluation is held by too many persons in education. Indeed, some educators view evaluation merely as a current fad. The correct view of evaluation is that it should illuminate problems and issues rather than merely adjudicate worth of a program as an evaluator sees it.

Evaluation research in the minds of some educational researchers is not appealing. In actuality, however, this is a myth. Apparently to them, the results of evaluation research are not as "publishable" as the results from more theoretically oriented research. Hence, some educational researchers -- especially new persons who are just entering the field and who are concerned with getting off on the right foot toward a lifetime career -- seem to be reluctant to enter the field of evaluation research. Upon entering a traditional educational research environment, according to the myth, the researcher hopes to gain wide respect through his many publications in his particular theoretical relevance; they will accommodate his creative concepts. On the other hand, if he enters upon work that is heavily evaluation oriented, so the myth goes, he expects his studies to deal largely with ungeneralizable matters, which are directed by policy-makers who administer schools, not by his own creative instincts. To follow the myth further, the theoretical researcher could expect to receive accolades and recognition from his colleagues. But, if he has entered the area of evaluation and reports his evaluation findings, he is apt to draw criticism of his methodology, his findings, his cause-effect linkages, and sometimes even his competence and personality.

But PREPS has helped to demythologize the utilitarian value of educational evaluation research. The PREPS model from the beginning has stressed <u>utilization</u> and <u>application</u> of evaluation results. PREPS has

stressed that a too-long time-lag from origin to application of evaluation results may nullify the best of efforts. Hence, the PREPS model encompasses a change consultant role for its staff members both at the IHE and at the local school levels because it is difficult for planned change (reform) to be carried out without evaluation and vice versa.

As can be seen from this brief discussion of its model components, PREPS has drawn upon several bodies of theory, especially that of change or diffusion theory. Much of the work on the concept of change has focused on the generation of sound information and its effective communication to an operating system for use in building problem-solving capacity. In performance of its role, PREPS has found that it is necessary to provide support for curricular change, and thus reform, at the teacher level the school level, the school district level, the school/community level, and the state department/legislature level. PREPS -- possibly unwittingly -- just may have discovered why education in Mississippi has not changed as rapidly as it has in some other states. Until just recently, the education system was focused on problem-oriented change -- "Identify a problem and it's half solved," so the saying goes. But in the past few years, there has emerged an emphasis on growth-oriented change, the idea being that apparently education has potential as an economic development tool. Motivation for change exists in many forms, such as recognition of the need for increased self-renewal capacity and growth. Or, there may be an innate desire for change itself or for creative expression. These forces perhaps account for as much or more change in schools than does problem identification; and problem-oriented change is seldom as effective as growth-oriented change.

"Locus of control" is another concept that has influenced PREPS activities. Decisions as to PREPS research and evaluation priorities rest

with the local school district. With help from the PREPS staff at the MSU/COE, local school personnel identify and describe the curricular programs, projects, and problems that need researching or evaluating. All decisions are approved by the local school superintendent, who also serves as a member of the PREPS Advisory Council. The schedule for conducting a study is largely determined by the local school staff, as is the time for summarizing and reporting of results. The PREPS Advisory Council determines policy concerning membership fees, annual statewide studies, and priorities for PREPS activities such as microcomputer applications, test-item banking, etc. Interaction with local teachers and administrators provides the "locus of control" that is necessary for the success of PREPS. MSU/COE staff members who work with PREPS schools assume the role of a local school district staff member in carrying out their duties. In essence, this is tantamount to a local school staff having on-call an entire IHE staff as an ancillary cadre of specialists whom they can call by telephone, or have them visit their school, or they can come to the campus for consultation.

Assurance of this kind of access to extra-school assistance is a key component of the PREPS model. And, it is evident that it has changed the traditional research role of the MSU/COE. Such close association/interaction is beneficial to school renewal capacity building, since most problems experienced in local school districts are very complex and are not subject to simplistic solutions. Also, continuity of availability of assistance to a school enhances depth of familiarity with the local school situation, and is helpful in determining levels of expertise among IHE staff members, which in itself holds promise as one consideration for better balance of staff persons to replace IHE staff members who retire or move.

Summary. Although the PREPS model has been in use for some years, it is still viewed as a tentative working model. Diffusion theorists contend that any model that is used to bring about change must be judged for adequacy against certain criteria. These criteria are:

1. A model should be practical. PREPS has undergone revision to achieve practicality; its activities have evolved or changed, but its basic mission and governance structure have not undergone radical change.

2. Components of a model should be manipulable. Component flexibility for any model assures its adaptation to differing situations, curricular programs, types of school districts, and administrative styles.

3. Economy of use is necessary. The consortium concept permits use and application of high-powered research and evaluation methodologies at low-cost to each member school district.

4. Model components must be easily communicated. Astuteness of staff members both at the IHE and at the local school levels permits the most complex of concepts to be interpreted, transmitted, and placed into the appropriate context. Mutual respect for the expertise and integrity between staff members at all levels is an absolute prerequisite for successful communication.

5. The model should be comprehensive. PREPS was not originally designed to include a staff-development component other than inservicing for research and evaluation skills acquisition. A teaching skills inservicing component would, of course, make the PREPS model more comprehensive than it currently is. However, as a model that discovers, identifies, diagnoses, researches, summarizes, interprets, suggests curricular revisions, and leads to change within the parameters of its mission, PREPS is unsurpassed.

6. The model should be synergistic -- it should consider multiple forces and factors working in concert. The PREPS model permits local school systems to address simultaneously national, regional, and local community issues; e.g., how to address lowered ACT and SAT scores, while simultaneously considering the need for adjustments to meet community economic development, as well as state educational reform requirements.

7. The model should lend itself to intervening in phases. The change process is influenced by innumerable variables which fluctuate in intensity over time. Models that are phase-specific and which have flexibility of application usually have the greatest probability for success. If possible, major educational changes should be introduced when major changes are occurring in the larger society. PREPS is an unusually effective model for intervening at different points to bring about reform.

8. The model should permit differential resource investment in the components. The PREPS model permits varying sizes of school districts, each with a differing administrative structure, to allocate resources (money, time, staff, etc.) to the various model components in a differential manner; e.g., a large school district may allocate different resources in different amounts to the same component compared to resource allocations to the same component by a smaller district.

9. The model should recognize the influences on the rest of the system caused by the change process. Such influences are referred to as the "ripple effect." For example, decisions about curricular changes in one grade level may affect the next grade level. Similarly, certain curricular changes for one program resulting from research or evaluation studies may affect the instructional management strategies for several

other programs. PREPS permits evaluation of programs that cut across grade levels, and studies that cut across disciplines or content lines.

10. The model must be flexible and versatile enough for application to different organizational structures. Mississippi has at least eight different types of school districts; some districts appoint the superintendents, some elect them. Some districts are very large; many are very small, enrollment-wise. The PREPS model accommodates all.

11. The model must provide for evaluation, effectiveness, and impact assessment of change. Such measures are included in the PREPS model, although these measures may not be taken as systematically as needed. But when taken, these measures point to the need for PREPS to expand its activities and/or to change its priorities.

12. The model should recognize the humanness of the participants involved. PREPS recognizes the need for upgrading research and evaluation skills among staff members at local school district offices. Similarly, PREPS recognizes the need for updating the awareness and knowledge levels of IHE staff. Interactional communication is a major emphasis of the PREPS model.

This paper is a description of a delivery system that is trying to improve the effectiveness of public schools. The system was initiated from the local school level, with an IHE being asked to help. PREPS, as [illegible] of model, has evolved; it did not "explode on the scene," as it were. It has struggled for survival. It has made fabulous contributions to the betterment of Mississippi schools. It was asked to help design the Education Reform Act of 1982. It was asked to lead in the design of the state's Accountability and Instructional Management (AIM) plan. It has held workshops in research, evaluation, test development, and computer

technologies for more than 1,000 teachers and other school personnel. It has raised the visibility level of research and evaluation strategies in the state. It has brought the IHE into closer contact with public schools.

It has done all these things efficiently and effectively. Hence, most any IHE with a desire to be of greater service to public education would jump at the chance to join a consortium like PREPS. By participating in PREPS, our IHE has been better able to keep up with changes that occur in schools and the issues they face. Similarly, by maintaining an up-to-date awareness of school problems, we have been better able to articulate and substantfate the need for changes in the teacher education strategies that compromise the curriculum of the MSU/COE. Interaction with the schools allows the IHE to keep up with the details of administrative rules and regulations that reach the local school from state, regional, and national levels. As the schools have become more adept at being accountable, so has the IHE. Such school-IHE interaction has resulted in the design of more efficient networks for information exchange. Identifying more accurately the needs for inservicing and staff development for school personnel has been a by-product of this interaction. Accurate assessment of such needs will aid the MSU/COE in developing assistance to meet teacher certification and teacher evaluation issues which are parts of the Education Reform Act of 1982.

In conclusion, the MSU/COE joined the consortium at its inception because PREPS represented an innovative alternative at a time when a new vision was essential. The focus of PREPS was to be on a special group of rural and/or small schools in a relatively rural and unindustrialized state which had been all but forgotten or ignored by existing federal and regional programs and policies that were then, and still are, being concentrated on

urban and inner-city school problems. When an assessment is made of PREPS impact, it will reveal substantive results that will support much of what is contained in diffusion theory and the underlying constructs of organizational development for renewal.